



# Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Physics, Computer Science & Mathematics Division

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

HAVE WE SEEN OUR FIRST GLUEBALL?

Michael Chanowitz

December 1980

RECEIVED  
LAWRENCE  
BERKELEY LABORATORY

MAR 6 1981

LIBRARY AND  
DOCUMENTS SECTION



LBL-11977  
c.2

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

December 1980

LBL-11977

# HAVE WE SEEN OUR FIRST GLUEBALL?

Michael Chanowitz

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

## ABSTRACT

Evidence is presented that there are at least two states near 1.4 GeV which decay to  $\bar{K}K\pi$ . One is  $E(1420)$ , an axial vector, and the other is  $G(1440)$ , probably a pseudoscalar. The pseudoscalar is likely to be a glueball.



The discovery of gluonium states would be dramatic confirmation of Quantum Chromodynamics. But their identification is an extremely challenging problem, because of the usual experimental difficulties of meson spectroscopy in the likely 1-2 GeV region, compounded by our inability to predict reliably the dynamical properties which might provide useful experimental signatures.<sup>1</sup> Lacking a reliable, detailed understanding of the gluonium spectrum and dynamics, the experimental search can rely only on the most generic features of the theoretical picture. One such property is that gluonium states do not fit into  $\bar{q}q$  multiplets. Another is that their production is enhanced in channels which are rich in gluons.

Since the radiative decays  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$  are dominated in perturbation theory<sup>2</sup> by  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma + 2$  gluons, they provide an excellent channel for the search. The prominent appearance of a  $\bar{K}K\pi$  enhancement at 1440 MeV is therefore very striking.<sup>3-5</sup> It is produced at a rate comparable to the other most prominent hadron in the channel, the  $\eta'(958)$ . In contrast, the E(1420), with which we are tempted to identify the 1440, has been an obscure, difficult state to study in hadronic reactions. This contrast provides prima facie grounds for examining the 1440 as a gluonium candidate.

A first examination is not encouraging. First observed in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest,<sup>6</sup> E(1420) has been seen in recent high statistics pion scattering experiments<sup>7,8</sup> with a clear preference<sup>7</sup> for  $J^P = 1^+$ . E(1420) and D(1285) are then excellent candidates to be the  $I = 0$  members of the  $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$  nonet. In addition, if the  $\bar{K}K\pi$  enhancement in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$  has  $J^P = 1^+$ , then it cannot couple to two massless gluons,<sup>9</sup> which further undermines the rationale for regarding it as a gluonium candidate.

There is however an indication that the state observed in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$

is not the state seen in pion scattering. In  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$ ,  $80 \pm 20\%$  of the  $(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.44}$  signal is reportedly<sup>5</sup> due to  $\delta\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi$ , whereas in pion scattering<sup>7</sup>  $K^*K$  dominates,  $B(1.4 \rightarrow K^*K)/B(1.4 \rightarrow K^*K + \delta\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi) = .86 \pm .14$ .

Motivated by these considerations I have systematically reviewed the experimental literature on the  $E(1420)$  meson. I have reached the following conclusions:

(1) There are at least two  $I^C = 0^+$  states near 1.4 GeV which decay to  $\bar{K}K\pi$ . The  $E(1420)$  has  $J^P = 1^+$  and decays primarily to  $K^*K$ . The other state, which I call  $G(1440)$ ,<sup>10</sup> decays to  $\bar{K}K\pi$  and to  $\eta\pi\pi$ ; both these decays have substantial  $\delta\pi$  components.

(2) The  $(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.4}$  signals in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$  and in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest are predominantly  $G(1440)$ , while those in  $\pi$  scattering (all with  $p_{\text{LAB}} > 4$  GeV) are predominantly  $E(1420)$ . In  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation above threshold ( $p_{\text{LAB}} > .7$  GeV) there is substantial production of  $G$  and  $E$ .

(3)  $E(1420)$  is the dominantly  $\bar{s}s$  member of an ideally mixed nonet containing the  $A_1$ ,  $D$ ,  $E$ , and  $Q$  (appropriately mixed<sup>11</sup>).

(4) Although the spin-parity of  $G$  is not as clearly determined as that of  $E$ , all available evidence favors  $J^P(G) = 0^-$ .

(5)  $G(1440)$  is unlikely to be a  $\bar{q}q$  meson. The most likely possibility is that it is predominantly a glueball, perhaps with an appreciable  $\bar{q}q$  component.

These conclusions are based on an examination of the experimental literature, which is briefly summarized below and will be presented in detail elsewhere. The evidence for two states is based on four categories of experimental results:

(A)  $\eta\pi\pi$  decay: the  $\bar{K}K\pi$  signal is seen in all processes ( $\pi^{7,8,12,13}$  and  $\bar{p}^{6,14-19}$  scattering and  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X^{3-5}$ ) but the  $\eta\pi\pi$  signal is seen only in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation<sup>20</sup> and  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$ ,<sup>4,5</sup> not in  $\pi$  scattering.<sup>21,12</sup> This is not an experimental artifact: the  $\pi p$  experiments which do not see an  $(\eta\pi\pi)_{1.4}$  signal are exceedingly sensitive, far more sensitive than the  $\bar{p}$  and  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$  measurements which do. For instance, the most sensitive  $\pi p$  experiment<sup>21</sup> observes 3000  $\eta' \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$  decays and no significant  $(\eta\pi\pi)_{1.4}$  signal, while a  $\bar{p}$  experiment<sup>20</sup> with only  $\sim 100$  observed  $\eta' \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$  decays reports a signal in  $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-(\eta\pi^+\pi^-)_{1.4}$  with  $\sigma = 275 \pm 50 \mu\text{b}$ . There is also an indication<sup>4,5</sup> of a signal in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma(\eta\pi^+\pi^-)_{1.4}$ , largely in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma\delta\pi \rightarrow \gamma\eta\pi\pi$ ; the number of events is comparable to the 10-15 events observed for  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\eta\pi^+\pi^-$ .

(B) Dalitz plots: because of kinematical overlaps the  $\delta\pi$  and  $K^*K$  branching ratios cannot simply be extracted from  $\bar{K}K$  and  $K\pi$  mass histograms. An overall fit to the  $\bar{K}K\pi$  Dalitz plot is essential. The Mark II Dalitz plot<sup>3</sup> is enhanced toward the  $\delta$  region. There are events in the  $K^*$  region but they neither form uniform hands (as they would if the 1.44 had spin 1) nor bands which grow toward the boundaries from central nodes (as for spin 0). An analysis of these features yielded the result<sup>5</sup> that  $80 \pm 20\%$  of the  $\bar{K}K\pi$  signal is due to  $\delta\pi$ . In contrast, the Dalitz plot obtained from  $\pi$  scattering at  $p_{\text{LAB}} = 4 \text{ GeV}$  is dominated by uniform (except at the point of overlap)  $K^*$  bands, with the  $K^*K$  signal at least six times larger than  $\delta\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi$ .<sup>7</sup> The only other published Dalitz plot, from  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest,<sup>19</sup> resembles the Mark II plot: a  $\bar{K}K$  threshold enhancement and no complete  $K^*$  bands (no over-all



fit was made in this case).<sup>22</sup>

(C)  $J^P$  determinations: the analysis<sup>7,23</sup> of the Dalitz plot obtained from  $\pi p$  scattering gives strong evidence for  $J^P = 1^+$ . The high statistics experiment<sup>6</sup> which first discovered the E/G in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest favored  $J^P = 0^-$ , based on analyses of the  $\bar{K}K\pi$  Dalitz plot<sup>24</sup> and also on the angular distribution of  $\delta$  with respect to  $\pi^0 \pi^0$  in  $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0(1.4) \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0(\delta\pi)$ . The latter evidence is very convincing if  $J(\pi^0 \pi^0) = 0$  as assumed; this is very likely since  $J = 2$  is the next possibility and  $Q$  is only 170 MeV. Results from  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation above threshold are inconclusive,<sup>16-18</sup> favoring  $J^P = 0^-$  and/or  $1^+$ .

(D) Production of D(1280): a long standing puzzle in the history of E(1420) is the absence of a D(1280) signal in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest,<sup>6,19</sup> although D is typically produced (roughly 5 times<sup>25,26</sup>) more copiously than E in  $\pi p$  scattering<sup>7,12,13</sup> and in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation<sup>14-17</sup> with  $p_{\text{LAB}} \geq .7$  GeV. The greater cross section for D is consistent with the hypothesis that D and E are the nearly ideally mixed isoscalars of the  $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$  nonet, also supported by the small branching ratio<sup>26</sup> for  $D \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi$  (much of which may be  $D \rightarrow \delta\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi$  and therefore not attributable to an  $\bar{s}s$  component in D) and by the recent definitive high statistics, nondiffractive observation<sup>27</sup> of the  $A_1$  with  $m_{A_1} = m_D$  as expected for ideal mixing. The striking absence of a D signal in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest<sup>6,19</sup> then suggests that the  $(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.4}$  signal which is observed there is not the E. Similarly there is no evidence for  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma D$ , though  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$  is dominated by X in the SU(3) singlet,<sup>28</sup> so that with ideal mixing we expect  $\Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma D) \cong 2\Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma E)$ . This is just at the



edge of being excluded by the upper bound<sup>3</sup> on  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.28}$ , but a still stronger constraint follows from the absence<sup>4</sup> of a  $D$  signal in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta\pi\pi$  (since<sup>26</sup>  $B(D \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi) = .5$ ).

This entire pattern of observations is compatible with hypotheses (1), (2), and (3). In pion scattering the absence of  $(\eta\pi\pi)_{1.4}$ , the dominance of  $K^*K$  in  $(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.4}$ , the result  $J^P = 1^+$ , and the large  $D$  signal all indicate  $E$  production. But in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$ , the indication of  $(\eta\pi\pi)_{1.4}$  with a sizeable  $\delta\pi$  component, the dominance of  $\delta\pi$  in  $(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.4}$ , and the absence of  $D$  (especially in  $\eta\pi\pi$ ) all suggest  $G$  production. In  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest<sup>29</sup> the preference for  $J^P = 0^-$ , the striking absence of  $D$  and the evidence for a sizeable  $\delta\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi$  component again suggest  $G$  production. Finally, in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation with  $p_{\text{LAB}} \geq .7 \text{ GeV}$ , the presence of both  $D$  and  $(\eta\pi\pi)_{1.4}$  and the inconclusive nature of the  $J^P$  analyses suggest that both  $E$  and  $G$  are substantially produced.

What is the spin of  $G$ ? The most direct evidence is the result  $J^P = 0^-$  in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest.<sup>6</sup> This is also consistent with the following considerations:

a) In lowest order QCD, the principal partial waves in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$  are<sup>30</sup>  $J^P(X) = 0^-, 0^+, 2^+$ .  $G$  has abnormal  $J^P$  since  $G \rightarrow \delta\pi$ , so only  $0^-$  is possible.

b) In  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest into  $X\pi\pi$  with  $I^G(X) = 0^+$  the final state may be pure s-wave only if  $J^P(X) = 0^-$ . For  $m_X = 1.42 \text{ GeV}$  or  $1.28 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $Q$  is very small and the relative inhibition of the p-wave is appreciable. The assignments  $J^P(G) = 0^-$  and  $J^P(E) = J^P(D) = 1^+$  could then provide a kinematical explanation for the suppression of  $D$

and  $E$ .

c) The  $\delta\pi$  decay is favored if  $J^P(G) = 0^-$  since it is then the only open two-body, s-wave channel (like  $K^*K$  for  $E$  if  $J^P(E) = 1^+$ ).<sup>31</sup>

d) If  $J^P(G) = 0^-$ , helicity conservation enhances the amplitude for  $G \rightarrow \bar{s}s$  over  $G \rightarrow \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d$ . The  $\bar{s}s$  quarks materialize as  $\bar{K}K\pi$  in an s-wave, which some fraction of the time appears as  $\delta\pi$  by final state interaction. This enhances the  $\delta\pi$  yield and the nonresonant  $\bar{K}K\pi$  final state.

If we suppose  $G$  is distinct from  $E$  and  $J^P(G) = 0^-$ , how can we decide if  $G$  is a glueball? If it is not a glueball, then it is most likely to be a radially excited  $\bar{q}q$  meson. There are already two excellent candidates for an excited  $J^{PC} = 0^{-+}$  nonet,  $K'(1400)$  and  $\zeta(1275)$  ( $\zeta$  is named in honor of the ZGS, R. I. P. - it is called  $\eta(1275)$  in the data card listings of ref. (26)). The  $\zeta$  was observed in a partial wave analysis of  $\pi^-p \rightarrow \zeta n \rightarrow \eta \pi^+ \pi^- n$ , in the very sensitive  $\pi p$  experiment<sup>21</sup> which did not see a significant  $\eta\pi\pi$  signal near 1.4 GeV. We might hypothesize that  $G$  and  $\zeta$  are the two isoscalars in the nonet.

However this hypothesis is not tenable, regardless of the  $SU(3)$  mixing angle between  $G$  and  $\zeta$ . The crucial facts have been presented above: a) in  $\pi p$  scattering<sup>21</sup>  $\zeta \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi$  is strongly present but there is no significant signal for  $G \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi$  while b) in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$   $G$  is strongly present in  $\bar{K}K\pi$  and indicated in  $\eta\pi\pi$  but there is no indication of  $\zeta$  in  $\bar{K}K\pi$  nor, most to the point, in  $\eta\pi\pi$ .<sup>3,4</sup> To explain  $\Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma G) \gg \Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma \zeta)$  we need to assume<sup>28</sup> singlet-octet mixing, similar to that of  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$ . But then we expect

$$\frac{\sigma(\pi^+ p \rightarrow nG)}{\sigma(\pi^+ p \rightarrow n\zeta)} \cong \frac{\sigma(\pi^+ p \rightarrow n\eta')}{\sigma(\pi^+ p \rightarrow n\eta)}$$

which is badly violated. At  $p_{\text{LAB}} = 8 \text{ GeV}$  the right side is  $\sim \frac{1}{2}$  while the left side must be much smaller.<sup>32</sup> To accomodate a small value for the left side we would need to invoke ideal mixing with  $G \cong \bar{s}s$ . But then we would expect<sup>28</sup>  $\Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma\zeta) \cong 2\Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma G)$  and, even worse,  $\Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma\zeta \rightarrow \gamma\eta\pi\pi) \gg \Gamma(\psi \rightarrow \gamma G \rightarrow \gamma\eta\pi\pi)$ , since  $\eta\pi\pi$  would be an OZI suppressed decay of  $G$ .  $G$  is unlikely to be the  $I = 0$  partner of  $\zeta$ .

There is a variety of additional information bearing on whether  $G$  is a  $\bar{q}q$  state. The rates for  $G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and  $G \rightarrow \rho\gamma$  would be rather large if  $G$  were a  $\bar{q}q$  meson.<sup>33</sup> And, of course, if  $\zeta(1275)$  were confirmed and an acceptable  $I = 0$  partner found for it, that would exclude  $G$  from the nonet. There is a hint of a pseudoscalar near  $1.4 \text{ GeV}$ , seen in  $\pi p$  scattering.<sup>21</sup> Since the peak is below  $1.4 \text{ GeV}$  and appears not at all in  $\delta\pi \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi$  but only in  $\epsilon\eta$  (" $\epsilon$ " here denotes a parameterization of the  $I = J = 0$  dipion phase shift), it is unlikely to be the  $G$ . The small magnitude of the signal would be explained if it were the predominantly  $\bar{s}s$  member of the nonet. Like  $\zeta$  it would appear much less strongly than  $G$  in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$ , but it might be part of the  $(\bar{K}K\pi)_{1.4}$  signal in  $\bar{p}p$  annihilation at rest, where an anomalously large width was reported,<sup>6</sup>  $\Gamma = 80 \pm 10 \text{ MeV}$ . This could be tested by comparing the  $\eta\pi\pi$  and  $\bar{K}K\pi$  decay channels. (It is clear from the proliferating  $\bar{q}q$  spectrum alone, that the  $1\text{--}2 \text{ GeV}$  region may have many overlapping resonances.)

What about evidence that  $G$  is a glueball, as opposed to evidence that it is not a  $\bar{q}q$  meson? If  $G$  were prominent in another,

essentially different hard gluon channel, the case would become quite convincing. Gluon jets are a good place to look. Just as the leading particle in a charmed quark jet is a charmed hadron, glueballs may frequently appear among the leading particles of a gluon jet.<sup>34,35</sup> Quarkonium decays,<sup>35</sup> and low thrust  $e^+e^-$  annihilations in the continuum are good sources of gluon jets. It would be highly suggestive if there were again an enhanced  $G$  signal in this class of events.

Conclusion: it appears that there are at least two states in the 1.4 GeV region which decay to  $\bar{K}K\pi$  and that one may be a glueball. These conclusions can be tested with increased statistics in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$ ; with higher energy  $e^+e^-$  collisions at CESR, PETRA, PEP and the coming generation of  $Z$  factories; and with high statistics  $\bar{p}p$  studies at LEAR. A more complete presentation of this analysis and of the future experimental tests is in preparation.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Bob Cahn, Dan Scharre, and George Trilling for useful discussions.

This work was supported by the High Energy Physics Division of the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. W-7405-ENG-48.

#### References:

1. For recent reviews with additional references see J. Bjorken, Proc. SLAC Summer Inst., p. 219, 1979 and J. Donohue, VI Intl. Conf. on Meson Spectroscopy, Brookhaven MITCTP 854, 1980.
2. T. Appelquist et al., PRL 34, 365, 1975; M. Chanowitz, PR D12, 918, 1975; L. Okun and M. Voloshin, ITEP-95, 1976.
3. D. Scharre et al., SLAC-PUB-2514, 1980.

4. E. Bloom, Proc. SLAC Summer Inst. 1980 (to be published).
5. D. Scharre, VI Intl. Conf. on Meson Spectroscopy, Brookhaven, SLAC-PUB-2519, 1980.
6. P. Baillon et al., NC 50A 393, 1967.
7. C. Dionisi et al., NP B169, 1, 1980.
8. C. Bromberg et al., PR D22, 1513, 1980.
9. C. N. Yang, PR 77, 242, 1950.
10. The name  $G$  and the glueball interpretation for the signal in  $\psi \rightarrow \gamma \bar{K} K \pi$  are independently proposed by J. Donohue, K. Johnson and Bing An Li, MITCTP HEP-139, 1980, received after the work reported here was completed. An opposing view, assuming a single state, is presented by C. E. Carlson et al., William and Mary preprint, 1980.
11. M. Mazzucato et al., NP B156, 532, 1979.
12. M. Corden et al., NP B144, 253, 1978.
13. O. Dahl et al., PR 163 1377, 1967.
14. R. Nacash et al., NP B135 203, 1978.
15. T. Handler et al., NP B110 173, 1976.
16. V. Vuillemin et al., NC 33A 133, 1976 and Lett. al NC 14 165, 1975.
17. J. Duboc et al., NP B46 429, 1972.
18. B. Lörstad et al., NP B14 63, 1969.
19. N. Barash et al., PR 156 1399, 1967.
20. C. Defoix et al., NP B44 125, 1972.
21. N. Stanton et al., PRL 42 346, 1979.
22. Caution is required by the varying statistics and backgrounds of these three plots.

23.  $J^P = 1^+$  is also favored in Ref. 12.
24. The Dalitz plot of Ref. 6 is unpublished and is not to be confused with the lower statistics, published plot of Ref. 19. The fit of Ref. 6 yielded equal  $K^* \bar{K}$  and  $\delta\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi$  signals, unlike what is suggested by the appearance of the plot in Ref. 19.
25. I use  $B(D \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi) = .1$  (from Ref. 26) and  $B(E \rightarrow \bar{K}K\pi) \cong 1$  for this estimate.
26. Particle Data Group, RMP 53 S1, 1980.
27. C. Daum et al., PL 89B 281, 1980.
28. The naive arguments are very sensitive to SU(3) breaking - R. Cahn and M. Chanowitz, PL 59B 277, 1975 and H. Fritzsch and J. Jackson, PL 66B 365, 1977 - but are in qualitative accord with the data - see Ref. 5.
29. One low statistics experiment (M. Foster et al., NP B8 174, 1968) saw no  $\eta\pi\pi$  signal but was too insensitive to exclude a significant signal.
30. A. Billoire et al., PL 80B 381, 1979.
31. However  $D \rightarrow \delta\pi$  is a p-wave decay with a smaller Q value. This may be because  $\delta\pi$  is the only two body channel open to D in any partial wave.
32. From Ref. 21 the left side is  $\ll 1$  in the  $\zeta, G \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi$  channel and using the OIZ rule with the assumed mixing B.R.  $(G \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi) > B.R. (\zeta \rightarrow \eta\pi\pi)$ , which implies a large violation of the equation.
33. Details will be presented elsewhere.
34. J. Bjorken, op. cit.
35. P. Roy and T. Walsh, PL 78B 62, 1978.